



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/951,832	10/16/1997	CESAR Z. LINA	VAC.312B.US	2039

60402 7590 08/05/2008  
KINETIC CONCEPTS, INC.  
C/O SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. BOX 061080  
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
----------

HAND, MELANIE JO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3761

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 08/951,832	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LINA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MELANIE J. HAND	<b>Art Unit</b> 3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8, 13, 16-23, 25, 27-31, 33-36 and 40-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13, 16-21 and 28-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8, 13, 22, 23, 25, 27, 31, 40-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 22, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. With respect to argument A: In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The prior art of Kruger was introduced to remedy the deficiency of the McNeil reference with respect to a tube that explicitly connects to a wound dressing. As to applicant's argument that neither Krug nor Cope remedies the deficiency of McNeil as to a porous pad, it is stated explicitly in the Office action and in Col. 4, lines 15-17 and 38-41 of Cope that polyether foams, which form porous pads, and the processes for forming them are known. Since it is universally understood that foams retain fluids due to the presence of open cells, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of McNeil and Krug, disclosing an elastomeric dressing, by replacing said dressing with a porous polyether pad as both entities accomplish the identical result of absorbing exudate at a wound.
3. As to applicant's argument B, the citation of Col. 4, lines 15-17 and 38-41 should further clarify the manner in which Cope explicitly discloses that polyether foams are known. As to the argument that Cope does not disclose a tube connected to the pad or foam, again this limitation has already been met by the combination of the McNeil and Kruger references.
4. As to arguments in section II of applicant's Remarks, beginning on page 19, applicant argues that no motivation to combine the McNeil certainly suggests the presence of a wound

dressings connected to the end of the instant tube because the device is a suction device to collect bodily fluids, including wound exudate. The disclosure of such a device necessitates another entity which collects the fluid. Therefore, while such entity was not disclosed or was the focus of the prior art of McNeil, it is fairly suggested. Kruger also teaches a wound dressing with tube 20 for draining or irrigating a wound, and thus certainly fairly suggests the presence of a canister to which the opposite end of the tube 20 is attached as required in claim 8.

5. As to arguments in section III of the remarks, the prior art of Cope was solely relied upon to establish that porous polyether pads are known, therefore destruction of function is not of concern in the combination of the McNeil, Kruger and Cope references. One of ordinary skill in the art reviewing the disclosure of Cope at the portions cited *supra* would be able to discern that not all of the ingredients for a polyurethane foam cited by Cope are responsible for the electrically conductive nature of the foam, only the agent disclosed. Thus one of ordinary skill in the art following the disclosure of Cope could certainly make and use a polyurethane foam pad without any electrically conductive property simply by omitting the conductive agent disclosed. The resulting porous pad is fully capable of functioning as a porous pad in a wound drainage device as claimed and disclosed by McNeil and Kruger.

6. As to arguments in section IV, In response to applicant's argument that Cope is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Cope discloses a polyurethane foam that can either be formed with electrically conductive property or not. Both types of foams are widely used in the wound drainage art, e.g. pads with

silver ions that are both electrically conductive and antimicrobial. Therefore, Cope is certainly reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which applicant is concerned.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 41 recites the limitation "the recess" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3-8, 22, 23, 25, 27, 31-41, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeil et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,710,165) in view of Kruger (U.S. Patent No. 4,743,232) and further in view of Cope et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,028,355).

With respect to **claim 8**: McNeil teaches a canister 22 for collecting fluids drawn through standard connecting tubes from a drainage site on a human, such as a wound via patient port 32 of collection canister 22. The canister 22 is fluidly connected with a second end of the standard connecting tube, which is opposite the first end of said tube located at the drainage

Art Unit: 3761

site, via said port 32. Suction pump 10 applies negative pressure to said canister, and thus also said tube, said suction pump 10 being fluidly connected to said canister 22 via line 26. At least one bacterial filter 24 is positioned in line 26 between said canister 22 and said pump 10. A sensor in the form of a “full level” sensor detects when said canister 22 is substantially full with fluid, said sensor being associated with said suction pump 10 via a logic circuit having an AND gate 124 that controls power to pump motor 80 to discontinue application of the negative pressure when a substantially full condition of said canister is detected. (‘165, Col. 5, lines 1-31, 36-40, Col. 7, lines 52-57, Col. 8, lines 10-13)

McNeil does not teach an elastomeric dressing. Kruger teaches an elastomeric dressing 10 comprising a polyether polyamide elastomer material and a tube 20 in fluid communication with the elastomeric film dressing 10. The dressing 10 has a pressure sensitive acrylic adhesive 14 in at least the peripheral areas and is inherently and necessarily capable of securing a porous pad thereunder to the tissue within a sealed space defined by the inner surface of the film dressing 10. Thus, the tube 20, which extends under the wound-facing surface of dressing 10, has a first end that would be in fluid communication with said porous pad via the dressing 10. (‘232, Col. 3, lines 32-45, Col. 3, lines 53 – Col. 4, lines 7, Col. 4, lines 16-25)

Neither McNeil nor Kruger teaches a porous pad which is permeable to fluids. Cope teaches that polyether foams and the methods of forming them are known in the art. These foams are permeable to fluids and thus capable of use as a porous pad for wound fluid absorption. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of the combined teaching of McNeil and Kruger so as to include a porous pad that is permeable to fluids to aid in absorption of wound exudates at the wound site. The combined teaching of McNeil and Kruger and Cope meets all of the limitations of claim 8 and thus is a therapeutic combination for promoting tissue healing. (‘355, Col. 4, lines 65-68)

With respect to **claim 3**: McNeil teaches that the canister 22 can be mounted on the side or beneath the pump, therefore the canister 22 is considered herein to be removably attached to a housing 10 for said pump.

With respect to **claim 4**: The canister 22 is removably received in a recess in the housing. (Fig. 1)

With respect to **claim 5**: Kruger teaches a tube 20 that is received in a bore 30 defined by plastic member 28 and continues through to below the wound-facing surface of dressing 10, where the porous pad would be located and is capable of being inserted into the porous pad, i.e. the tube is fitted as an interference fit into an interior portion of said porous pad, as an interference fit is interpreted herein as a fitting between two parts by friction alone.

With respect to **claim 6**: The pad of Cope comprises a polymer foam in the form of a polyether foam and has interconnecting cells. The motivation to combine the teachings of McNeil and Kruger and Cope is stated *supra* with respect to claim 8.

With respect to **claims 7,23**: The foam of Cope is a polyether reticulated foam having a void volume of more than 90%, which is interpreted herein as meaning that the foam has at least 90% interconnecting cells, which overlaps the claimed range of at least 95% interconnecting cells. The motivation to combine the teachings of McNeil and Kruger and Cope is stated *supra* with respect to claim 8.

Art Unit: 3761

With respect to **claim 22**: The foam of Cope is a polyether reticulated foam having a void volume of more than 90%, which is interpreted herein as meaning that the foam has at least 90% interconnecting cells. The motivation to combine the teachings of McNeil and Kruger and Cope is stated *supra* with respect to claim 8.

With respect to **claim 25**: McNeil does not teach a tilt sensor for determining tilting of said device beyond a predetermined angle. However, McNeil does fairly suggest a tilt sensor by teaching a shut-off valve that closes off line 26 to the pump 10 if the canister 22 is tipped, which would necessarily require tipping the entire device and carrying case 16 as the canister 22 is inside the carrying case 16 during use. The shut-off valve is part of canister 22, which is associated with said suction pump 10 via line 26 and discontinues application of the negative pressure when tilting of said combination, i.e. the device, beyond said predetermined angle is detected. Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of McNeil such that the canister, and thus the device, further comprises a tilt sensor to aid in the operation of the shut-off valve in the event that the shut-off valve has not already shut off negative pressure in line 26.

With respect to **claim 27**: The peripheral areas of the dressing of Kruger with the pressure-sensitive adhesive would necessarily extend beyond the periphery of the porous pad of Cope for adhering to intact skin around the wound, as Kruger teaches that the adhesive must adhere to the skin directly.

With respect to **claim 31**: McNeil teaches a canister 22 for collecting fluids drawn through standard connecting tubes from a drainage site on a human, such as a wound via patient port



32 of collection canister 22. The canister 22 is fluidly connected with a second end of the standard connecting tube, which is opposite the first end of said tube located at the drainage site, via said port 32. Suction pump 10 applies negative pressure to said canister, and thus also said tube, said suction pump 10 being fluidly connected to said canister 22 via line 26. At least one bacterial filter 24 is positioned in line 26 between said canister 22 and said pump 10. A sensor in the form of a "full level" sensor detects when said canister 22 is substantially full with fluid, said sensor being associated with said suction pump 10 via a logic circuit that controls power to pump motor 80 to discontinue application of the negative pressure when a substantially full condition of said canister is detected. ('165, Col. 5, lines 1-31, 36-40, Col. 7, lines 52-57, Col. 8, lines 10-13)

McNeil does not teach a tilt sensor for determining tilting of said combination beyond a predetermined angle. However, McNeil does fairly suggest a tilt sensor by teaching a shut-off valve that closes off line 26 to the pump 10 if the canister 22 is tipped, which would necessarily require tipping the entire device and carrying case 16 as the canister 22 is inside the carrying case 16 during use. The shut-off valve is part of canister 22, which is associated with said suction pump 10 via line 26 and discontinues application of the negative pressure when tilting of said combination, i.e. the device, beyond said predetermined angle is detected. Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of McNeil such that the canister, and thus the device, further comprises a tilt sensor to aid in the operation of the shut-off valve in the event that the shut-off valve has not already shut off negative pressure in line 26.

McNeil does not teach an elastomeric dressing. Kruger teaches an elastomeric dressing 10 comprising a polyether polyamide elastomer material and a tube 20 in fluid communication with the elastomeric film dressing 10. The dressing 10 has a pressure sensitive acrylic adhesive in all areas, and thus also peripheral areas, inherently and necessarily capable of securing a

Art Unit: 3761

porous pad thereunder to the tissue within a sealed space defined by the inner surface of the film dressing 10. Thus, the tube 20, which extends under the wound-facing surface of dressing 10, has a first end that would be in fluid communication with said porous pad via the dressing 10. ('232, Col. 3, lines 32-45, Col. 3, lines 53 – Col. 4, lines 7, Col. 4, lines 16-25)

Neither McNeil nor Kruger teaches a porous pad which is permeable to fluids. Cope teaches that polyether foams and the methods of forming them are known in the art. These foams are permeable to fluids and thus capable of use as a porous pad for wound fluid absorption. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of the combined teaching of McNeil and Kruger so as to include a porous pad that is permeable to fluids to aid in absorption of wound exudates at the wound site. The combined teaching of McNeil and Kruger and Cope meets all of the limitations of claim 31 and thus is a therapeutic combination for promoting tissue healing. ('355, Col. 4, lines 65-68)

With respect to **claim 32**: McNeil teaches that the canister 22 can be mounted on the side or beneath the pump, therefore the canister 22 is considered herein to be removably attached to a housing 10 for said pump.

With respect to **claim 33**: The canister 22 is removably received in a recess in the housing. (Fig. 1)

With respect to **claim 34**: Kruger teaches a tube 20 that is received in a bore 30 defined by plastic member 28 and continues through to below the wound-facing surface of dressing 10, where the porous pad would be located and is capable of being inserted into the porous pad, i.e. the tube is fitted as an interference fit into an interior portion of said porous pad, as an

interference fit is interpreted herein as a fitting between two parts by friction alone.

With respect to **claim 35**: The pad of Cope comprises a polymer foam in the form of a polyether foam and has interconnecting cells. The motivation to combine the teachings of McNeil and Kruger and Cope is stated *supra* with respect to claim 8.

With respect to **claims 36,38**: The pad of Cope is a polyether reticulated foam having a void volume of more than 90%, which is interpreted herein as meaning that the foam has at least 90% interconnecting cells, which overlaps the claimed range of at least 95% interconnecting cells. The motivation to combine the teachings of McNeil and Kruger and Cope is stated *supra* with respect to claim 8.

With respect to **claim 37**: The foam of Cope is a polyether reticulated foam having a void volume of more than 90%, which is interpreted herein as meaning that the foam has at least 90% interconnecting cells. The motivation to combine the teachings of McNeil and Kruger and Cope is stated *supra* with respect to claim 8.

With respect to **claim 39**: The peripheral areas of the dressing of Kruger with the pressure-sensitive adhesive would necessarily extend beyond the periphery of the porous pad of Cope for adhering to intact skin around the wound, as Kruger teaches that the adhesive must adhere to the skin directly.

With respect to **claim 40**: McNeil teaches a canister 22 for collecting fluids drawn through standard connecting tubes from a drainage site on a human, such as a wound via patient port

32 of collection canister 22. The canister 22 is fluidly connected with a second end of the standard connecting tube, which is opposite the first end of said tube located at the drainage site, via said port 32. Suction pump 10 applies negative pressure to said canister, and thus also said tube, said suction pump 10 being fluidly connected to said canister 22 via line 26. At least one bacterial filter 24 is positioned in line 26 between said canister 22 and said pump 10. A sensor in the form of a "full level" sensor detects when said canister 22 is substantially full with fluid, said sensor being associated with said suction pump 10 via a logic circuit that controls power to pump motor 80 to discontinue application of the negative pressure when a substantially full condition of said canister is detected. McNeil teaches that the canister 22 can be mounted on the side or beneath the pump, therefore the canister 22 is considered herein to be removably attached to a housing 10 for said pump. The canister 22 is removably received in a recess in the housing. ('165, Fig. 1, Col. 5, lines 1-31, 36-40, Col. 7, lines 52-57, Col. 8, lines 10-13)

McNeil does not teach a tilt sensor for determining tilting of said combination beyond a predetermined angle. However, McNeil does fairly suggest a tilt sensor by teaching a shut-off valve that closes off line 26 to the pump 10 if the canister 22 is tipped, which would necessarily require tipping the entire device and carrying case 16 as the canister 22 is inside the carrying case 16 during use. The shut-off valve is part of canister 22, which is associated with said suction pump 10 via line 26 and discontinues application of the negative pressure when tilting of said combination, i.e. the device, beyond said predetermined angle is detected. Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of McNeil such that the canister, and thus the device, further comprises a tilt sensor to aid in the operation of the shut-off valve in the event that the shut-off valve has not already shut off negative pressure in line 26.

McNeil does not teach an elastomeric dressing. Kruger teaches an elastomeric dressing 10 comprising a polyether polyamide elastomer material and a tube 20 in fluid communication with the elastomeric film dressing 10. The dressing 10 has a pressure sensitive acrylic adhesive in all areas, and thus also peripheral areas, inherently and necessarily capable of securing a porous pad thereunder to the tissue within a sealed space defined by the inner surface of the film dressing 10. Thus, the tube 20, which extends under the wound-facing surface of dressing 10, has a first end that would be in fluid communication with said porous pad via the dressing 10. ('232, Col. 3, lines 32-45, Col. 3, lines 53 – Col. 4, lines 7, Col. 4, lines 16-25)

Neither McNeil nor Kruger teaches a porous pad which is permeable to fluids. Cope teaches that polyether foams and the methods of forming them are known in the art. These foams are permeable to fluids and thus capable of use as a porous pad for wound fluid absorption. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of the combined teaching of McNeil and Kruger so as to include a porous pad that is permeable to fluids to aid in absorption of wound exudates at the wound site. The combined teaching of McNeil and Kruger and Cope meets all of the limitations of claim 40 and thus is a therapeutic combination for promoting tissue healing.

The foam of Cope is a polyether reticulated foam having a void volume of more than 90%, which is interpreted herein as meaning that the foam has at least 90% interconnecting cells. The motivation to combine the teachings of McNeil and Kruger and Cope is stated *supra*. The peripheral areas of the dressing of Kruger with the pressure-sensitive adhesive would necessarily extend beyond the periphery of the porous pad of Cope for adhering to intact skin around the wound, as Kruger teaches that the adhesive must adhere to the skin directly. ('355, Col. 4, lines 65-68)

With respect to **claim 41**: McNeil teaches a latch attached to flap 20 of housing 10 holding the canister therein and securing the canister in the recess in the housing 10. (Fig. 1, Col. 5, lines 4-10)

With respect to **claim 43**: McNeil teaches that the contents of the canister 22 are visible when the front flap 20 is down. Thus, while McNeil does not explicitly teach that the canister includes a transparent window, McNeil fairly suggests such a window and it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the canister so as to include a transparent window with a reasonable expectation of success to preserve the ability to view the contents of the canister when the front flap 20 is down.

With respect to **claim 44**: McNeil teaches that the device contains a sensor that alerts the user when the canister is tipped. McNeil fairly suggests a tilt sensor. It is interpreted herein that the tipping taught by McNeil would necessarily require a predetermined tilt angle of about 45 degrees.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claim 42 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Reasons for Indicating Allowable Subject Matter***

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: A thorough search of the prior art of record did not disclose any reference, alone or in combination

with other reference(s) that teaches or fairly suggests a switch providing a signal indicating that the canister properly resides within the recess when the switch is pressed. While McNeil teaches or fairly suggests a sensor or other mechanism to indicate when the canister is tipped, which suggests a means to indicate that the canister properly resides within the recess, there is no motivation to further modify the device of McNeil and Kruger and Cope found in any of those references for a switch providing a signal to indicate that the canister properly resides within the recess switch is pressed.

### ***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELANIE J. HAND whose telephone number is (571)272-6464. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00-5:30, alternate Fridays 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melanie J Hand/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3761

/Tatyana Zalukaeva/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761